

REMARKS

It is our understanding that claims 1-30 remain pending in this application. **We proceed now with reference specifically to the numbered items in the Action.**

- 5 **Items 1-4 and 6:** These are informational in nature and are understood to require no reply.

Item 5 (§ 103(a) rejections):

Claims 1-30 are rejected as being unpatentable (obvious) over Linehan in view of Chen. Respectfully this is error.

- 10 Referring to claim 1, in 5.a.i.(1)-(6) the present Action restates the arguments of the prior Action. In reply again, Applicant here incorporates by reference its remarks in its last response.

The present Action additionally states, after 5.a.i.(1)-(6) “ii. [1] *Although Linehan teaches a system for determining communications events via network authentication, [2] Linehan is silent on the capability of showing the communication between communication parties. [3] On the other hand, Chen teaches this limitation in column 2, lines 24-48; column 4, lines 32-67 of Chen.*” With respect to [1], this is error for all of the reasons stated in the remarks in our last response and incorporated by reference herein.

With respect to [2], we agree, but we note that what is at issue is whether a cited reference teaches a key server element providing the particular capabilities of Applicant’s. This appears to be a concession that Linehan’s key server does not, yet only one of many deficiencies in Linehan’s key server is remedied by Chen.

With respect to [3], OK.

But this still leaves the issues of:

- 25 (1) What about the elements/limitations in claim 1 that are not taught by Linehan or Chen?
- (2) Can Linehan and Chen properly be combined?
- (3) And how can it be reconciled that the combination of Linehan and Chen cannot provide all of the advantages/capabilities/services that the invention recited in claim 1 can?

30 With respect to (1), in addition to serving keys, Applicant’s key server stores records in a database that includes respective controlling events. The Examiner has argued that Linehan

teaches this, but Applicant has shown that this simply is not so (see e.g., pg. 3, ln. 4-10 and ln. 20-23 of the last response). This is un rebutted by the Examiner.

Applicant's key server also determines positive events and negative events based on the controlling events and how many or when any key requests are received. The Examiner has also argued that Linehan teaches this, but Applicant has also shown that this simply is not so (see e.g., pg. 3, ln. 28 through pg. 4, ln. 29 of the last response). This is also un rebutted by the Examiner.

With respect to (2), Linehan teaches securing data files in a file server environment and Chen teaches securing communications across a firewall and an unsecured network (see e.g., abstracts of both). To state a prima facie case for obviousness the Examiner has to articulate a reasonable basis for combining the references. The Action does not do this.

With respect to (3), in Applicant's last response it was pointed out that the claimed invention provides capabilities that Linehan does not (see e.g., pg. 3, ln. 11-19 and also ln. 20 through pg. 4, ln. 29). Chen would permit a combination of Linehan and Chen to provide such capabilities. Accordingly, ignoring all else and if for no other reason, Applicant's claims then should be allowable because they are directed to a 35 USC § 101 improvement over the prior art.

With respect to claims 2-30, in reply again, Applicant here incorporates by reference its remarks in its last response.


CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to put this case into complete condition for allowance. It is thought that the §103 rejections have been completely rebutted. Applicant therefore asks that all rejections now be withdrawn and that allowance of all claims presently in the case be granted.

Intellectual Property Law Offices
1901 S. Bascom Ave., Suite 660
Campbell, CA 95008

Respectfully Submitted,

Telephone: 408.558.9950
Facsimile: 408.558.9960


Raymond E. Roberts
Reg. No.: 38,597